Remarks

Claims 1-21 are pending, and claims 1-21 stand rejected. The Applicants have amended claims 1-7 in this Response. The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections set forth by the Examiner.

Telephone Interview

A telephone interview was conducted between the undersigned Practitioner and the Examiner on April 14, 2010. Claim 1 was discussed with regards to the outstanding § 101 rejection of claims 1-7. Amendments to claims 1-7 were suggested whereby the rejected claims would positively recite that the steps of the method are performed on "a computer." The Examiner indicated that the amendments would be sufficient to overcome the outstanding § 101 rejection for claims 1-7.

35 U.S.C. § 101 Rejection

The Examiner rejected claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Specifically, the Examiner asserts that the claims are not tied to another statutory class of invention, and that the claims are sufficiently broad to read on a person mentally performing the recited steps. In view of the telephone interview outlined above, the Applicants have amended claims 1-7 to positively recite the claimed steps as being performed on a computer. Withdrawal of the outstanding § 101 rejection of claims 1-7 is therefore requested.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection

The Examiner rejected claims 1-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,603,478 (Kuo) in view of U.S. Patent Number 5,533,174 (Flowers), and in further view of U.S. PG-PUB 2002/0036652 (Masumoto). More specifically, the Examiner suggests that Masumoto teaches deleting a character from a font resource (Office Action, Page 6). The Applicants submit that this is a mischaracterization of what Masumoto teaches.

Claim 1 recites a computer implemented method for switching fonts without embedding font switches in the data. According to the method, a character is received by the computer to be effectively deleted from a first base font resource. A new font resource is created at the

computer which includes the received character. The new font resource is linked at the computer to the first base font resource to in effect delete the received character from the first base font resource. The new font resource and the first base font resource act as if they are a uniform font resource.

The Applicants submit that none of the art cited by the Examiner teaches or suggests the limitation of "linking said new font resource to said first base font resource to in effect delete the received character from said first base font resource" as recited in claim 1.

Masumoto discloses a presentation system including a display device. The display device receives one or more slide images (e.g., slides for a presentation) and modifies the slides images to render portions of the image invisible. This allows the presenter to include notes within the slide images that are not displayed during the presentation (Paragraphs 20-21).

In rejecting claim 1, the Examiner argues that making portions of the slides invisible teaches deleting characters from a font resource. The Applicants respectfully disagree, and submit that this is a mischaracterization of Masumoto. In Masumoto, a processor in the display receives the slide images from a terminal and deletes specific portions of the slide image to render the portions invisible. The processor may perform this deletion function by modifying the background color of the slide image to make it the same as the text color, deleting a text box, etc. (Paragraph 128). Nothing in Masumoto teaches that the processor in the display deletes fonts from a font resource, either directly or by linking a new font resource to a base font resource to effectively delete a received character. For example, nothing in Masumoto teaches that the processor in the display interacts with a font resource in the terminal in any meaningful way, such as by linking a font resource to a base font resource which includes characters for the slide images. Therefore, the Applicants submit that one skilled in the art would not even consider Masumoto as relevant in font modifying activities, such as those recited in claim 1.

The Applicants further submit that none of the remaining art cited by the Examiner teaches or suggests this limitation.

For at least the reasons provided, the Applicants submit that claim 1 is non-obvious in view of the art cited by the Examiner. Similar arguments apply for claim 8 and 15. Dependent claims 2-7, 9-14, and 16-21 are non-obvious at least for depending on base claims 1, 8, or 15, respectively.

Response to February 2, 2010 Office Action

Conclusion

The Applicants submit that claims 1-21 are non-obvious in view of the cited art, and therefore respectfully request the Examiner allow claims 1-21.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 22, 2010

/Sean J. Varley/

Sean J. Varley, Reg. No. 62,397
Duft, Bornsen & Fishman, LLP
1526 Spruce Street, Suite 302
Boulder, CO 80302
(303) 786-7687
(303) 786-7691 (fax)
Customer Number: 50441